

cost of living in Haiti is just about the same as it is in the U.S. Imagine having to survive on \$3 a week, 44 cents a day. 44 cents cannot buy a can of Campbell's soup, it cannot buy the \$2 used pair of shoes that one of your children is in desperate need of.

The Haitian workers are not being extravagant in their requests, asking for a 30 cent pay raise from 28 to 58 cents an hour. Right now the workers are receiving less than one half of one percent in the total cost of the merchandise they make, earning 7 cents for every \$11.99 pair of Pocohontas pajamas they sew. If granted their request they would be earning 9 cents out of every \$11.97 pair of pajamas they sew; that is a two cent difference. This would still leave Disney, the contractors and Walmart with over 99 percent of the profit.

Disney can afford to give a pay rise for its Haitian workers. It pays its CEO, Michael Eisner over \$10,000 an hour; \$10,000 compared to 28 cents. It would take a worker in Haiti sewing Disney clothes 14 and a half years to earn what Michael Eisner earns in one hour, and 29,000 years to earn what he earns in one year.

Finally, raising the wages of the Haitian workers would not only be beneficial to the workers themselves but to U.S. residents as well. A person earning 28 cents an hour who cannot even afford to feed her own family cannot afford to buy products made in the U.S.

I urge you, Congressman Sanders to look into the dealings of Disney in Haiti; I urge you to put pressure on companies such as Disney to stop the use of sweatshops; I urge you to get Disney to live up to its responsibilities as an employer. The Haitian people deserve better.

In the case of Disney I know that in Grand Rapids there is a factory and Disney moved its company overseas and a lot of people in Grand Rapids lost their jobs. They had been working there for 20 years, as much as 20 years, and now they are without jobs, working at McDonald's or whatever they can find.

The problem is so immense and when I was researching I found that our tax money is going towards helping executives and business people in Haiti continue these sweatshops and I think that needs to be stopped. And I think that even though we have laws, the corporate codes of conduct, et cetera, they are not being followed, so we need people to watch out over these companies because obviously these companies are not doing it themselves.

Citizens, consumers can watch what they are buying if they see something made from Disney, look at where it is made, and if it is made in Haiti you know these people are working for so long and have such hard hours and they are not earning anything. They do not even have enough food to eat. You have to consider that. The clock is really nice, but do you really want to support a sweatshop in Haiti?

HONORING GESU CATHOLIC
SCHOOL AS A BLUE RIBBON
SCHOOL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. I rise to recognize the outstanding achievements of Gesu Catholic School in University Heights, OH, of my congressional district. Richard Riley, Secretary of the Department of Education has

named Gesu Catholic School a Blue Ribbon School. This prestigious award is given to schools in recognition of excellence in teaching and learning. As one of only 263 public and private elementary and middle schools across the Nation to receive this honor, Gesu Catholic School should be commended as should its principal, Sister Mary Reiling, SND, for her strong leadership to the Gesu academic community.

Gesu Catholic School has a strong reputation for excellence in teaching and learning, family involvement, as well as a longstanding commitment to social justice and community outreach. In fact, every Gesu student participates in the gifted/enrichment program and is expected to achieve their maximum potential. Through a well rounded academic curriculum, supportive learning environment, and classroom experience that has been expanded beyond school walls, Gesu is helping its students gain a clear understanding of academic subjects and is teaching them to effectively and appropriately apply their knowledge to real experiences.

Secretary Riley honored Gesu Catholic School because it provides students with a safe, disciplined, and drug-free environment in which to pursue a challenging and rigorous academic experience. Gesu is a Blue Ribbon School because of the hard work of its students, the staunch commitment of its faculty and staff, and the continued support of its parents and graduates.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to commend the faculty, staff, students, and parents of this fine academic institution. By joining their efforts together, the Gesu academic community is providing a tremendous education for many students in my district.

OCC PROF. JAMES MACKILLOP
STEPS DOWN AS PRESIDENT OF
AMERICAN CONFERENCE FOR
IRISH STUDIES

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating James MacKillop as he steps down from his role of president of the American Conference for Irish Studies.

Professor MacKillop is in the English Department of Onondaga Community College. He has led with great energy and devotion a cultural group which conducts six scholarly meetings a year, awards three book prizes of \$500 each per year, and distributes publications on Irish civilization in all its aspects.

With more than 1,600 members in the United States, Canada, and Ireland and a dozen other countries, the ACIS touches on a diverse range of instruction, from women's studies to archeology to discussions of recent Irish cinema.

Professor MacKillop is well known in my district for his association with our shared Irish heritage as well as for his excellence in academic pursuits at our prized community college. I want to wish him well in his further studies of the Irish and their ancestry and customs which have contributed so much to the evolution of our American culture.

THE CASE FOR A MUCH SMALLER
MILITARY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the June 23d issue of Fortune magazine, Doug Bandow of the Cato Institute has a concise coherent and persuasive statement of the case for a substantial reduction in U.S. military spending. At a time when we are facing drastic measures in various places to meet the widely shared goal of a balanced budget, we can afford even less than before tens of billions of dollars in unnecessary military spending. As Mr. Bandow notes, "the bulk of the Pentagon budget continues to fund Washington's Cold War alliances. For example, through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 100,000 U.S. soldiers stand guard lest phantom Soviet divisions invade Europe * * * the final refuge of those who support big military budgets is 'leadership'. As Newt Gingrich puts it, 'you do not need today's defense budget to defend the United States. You need today's defense budget to lead the world'."

The notion that the United States must spend tens of billions of dollars a year for no valid military purpose but simply to enhance our world leadership, as Mr. Bandow goes on to point out, is simply wrong. Few dispute the importance of the United States being by far the strongest military power. What we are disputing is the need for us to spend tens of billions per year beyond what it takes to maintain that position for the nebulous privilege of leadership which, according to some apparently, we must purchase from our wealthy allies by subsidizing them.

Indeed, in the New York Times for June 4, an article noted that the Japanese plan to deal with their budget deficit by, among other things, further reducing their already very small military budget—secure, no doubt, in the knowledge that the United States taxpayers will provide.

I ask that Mr. Bandow's very thoughtful article be printed for the edification of Members as we debate the budget.

THE CASE FOR A MUCH SMALLER MILITARY
(By Doug Bandow)

How big a military does the U.S. need? The Pentagon, which recently completed its once-every-four-years review, thinks we need pretty much everything we've got. It proposes that we preserve the current force structure, pare manpower levels slightly, and allow inflation to slowly erode overall expenditures—all as if the Cold War had never ended. In reality, the nation's defense needs have changed very dramatically in recent years. The President and Congress should ignore the Pentagon's wish list and cut military spending much more deeply by more than a third.

Military spending is the price of our foreign policy, and after world War II that policy was dictated by the threat of an aggressive Soviet Union and its satellites. All told, America spent more than \$13 trillion (in today's dollars) to win the Cold War. But starting in 1989, all the old assumptions collapsed. The Central and Eastern European states overthrew communism, the Berlin Wall fell, and the Warsaw Pact dissolved. The Soviet Union itself disappeared. A foreign policy and force structure designed to deter Soviet aggression suddenly became obsolete.